

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 29-31, and 41-42 have been amended.

### **Summary of the Office Action**

Examiner objected to claims 3-4, 9-11, 29-31, and 49-50 due to informalities.

Examiner rejected claims 41-52 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-7, 12-13, 16, 21, 24, 32, 41-42, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,177 to Li et al.

Examiner rejected claims 3-4, 11, and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,878 to Anderson et al.

Examiner rejected claims 8-10, 14, 40, 48-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,430 to Fukuoka.

Examiner rejected claims 15, 18-20, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,920 to Anderson.

Examiner rejected claims 17, 29-31, 33-34, and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li.

Examiner rejected claims 22-23, 25-26, 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,493 to Acharya et al.

### **Response to claim objections**

Claims 3, 9-11, 29-31, and 49-50 have been amended as suggested by Examiner to overcome the objections.

### **Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 41 and 42 have been amended to overcome the rejections. Applicant requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

### **Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-7, 12-13, 16, 21, 24, 32, 41-42, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,177 to Li et al.

Claim 1, as amended, reads as follows:

A method for compressing digital images upon capture at a digital camera device, the method comprising:

receiving user input requesting capture of a sequence of digital images at the digital camera device, said digital images being stored in an image buffer;

applying a relatively-fast compression technique to temporarily compress at least some of the digital images from the sequence of digital images upon capture, so as to increase availability of storage in said image buffer for storing other digital images being captured;

at some point in time after cessation of the user input, decompressing the digital images that were temporarily compressed; and thereafter

applying a relatively-thorough compression technique to the captured sequence of digital images.

Li discloses truncating existing compressed embedded coded bitstreams of previously stored images. (Li, Abstract.) In Li, an embedded coding scheme is utilized to dynamically change the size of compressed images according to the number of stored pictures. (Li, 1: 40-42.) Li further discloses changing compression ratios, where *the stored images* (e.g., all of the images stored by the image storage device) are decoded first and then *the same stored images* are requantized and reencoded at the higher compression ratio. (Li, 3: 1-15.) In contrast, claim 1 recites “decompressing **the digital images that were temporarily compressed,**” and thereafter “applying a relatively-thorough compression technique to **the captured sequence of digital**

**images.”** In fact, Li fails to disclose or suggest decompressing images temporarily compressed using a relatively-fast compression technique and then compressing, using a relatively-thorough compression technique, the captured sequence of digital images.

Because not each and every element of claim 1 is disclosed in Li, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Li.

Claim 41 recites “a decompression module ... for **decompressing the digital images that were temporarily compressed** at some point in time after activation of said user-activated button” and “a second compression module ... for **compressing said sequence of digital images** more thoroughly than that provided by said first compression module.” Thus, claim 41 and its dependent claims are patentable over Li for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

#### **Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Examiner rejected claims 3-4, 11, and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,878 to Anderson et al.

Anderson discloses “a system and method for recovering from a power failure in a digital camera comprises a power manager for detecting power failures, an interrupt handler for responsively incrementing a counter device, service routines which register to receive notification of the power failure, and a processor for evaluating the counter and providing notification of the power failure to the service routines which then assist the digital camera to recover from the power failure.” (Anderson, Abstract.) Anderson fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1 or the limitations of claim 41 discussed above, whether considered separately or in combination with Li. In particular, neither Anderson nor Li teach or suggest “decompressing the digital images that were

temporarily compressed” and thereafter “applying a relatively-thorough compression technique to the captured sequence of digital images,” as recited in claim 1. Claims 3, 4, and 11 include the limitations of claim 1 by virtue of being dependent on claim 1.

Similarly, neither Anderson nor Li teach or suggest “recites “a decompression module ... for decompressing the digital images that were temporarily compressed at some point in time after activation of said user-activated button” and “a second compression module ... for compressing said sequence of digital images more thoroughly than that provided by said first compression module” as recited in claim 41. Claims 43-44 include the limitations of claim 41 by virtue of being dependent on claim 41.

Therefore, claims 3-4, 11, and 43-44 are patentable over the combination of Li and Anderson for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claims 1 and 41.

Examiner rejected claims 8-10, 14, 40, and 48-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,430 to Fukuoka.

Fukuoka discloses “a digital electronic camera which can accept various types of input/output cards or memory cards.” (Fukuoka, Abstract.) Fukuoka fails to address compression of the images at all. Therefore, Fukuoka does not remedy the shortcomings of Li discussed above, and Fukuoka in combination with Li fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1 or the limitations of claim 41 discussed above, whether considered separately or in combination with Li. Claims 8-10, 14, and 40 include the limitations of claim 1 by virtue of being dependent on claim 1. Claims 48-51 include the limitations of claim 41 by virtue of being dependent on claim 41. Therefore,

claims 8-10, 14, 40, and 48-51 are patentable over the combination of Li and Fukuoka for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claims 1 and 41.

Examiner rejected claims 15, 18-20, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,920 to Anderson (Anderson II).

Anderson II discloses “a method and system is disclosed for accelerating a user interface on a display of an image capture unit.” (Anderson II, Abstract.) Anderson II does not teach or suggest compression of images, and therefore fails to remedy the shortcomings of Li discussed above. Therefore, Anderson II in combination with Li fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1 or the limitations of claim 41 discussed above. Claims 15 and 18-20 include the limitations of claim 1 by virtue of being dependent on claim 1. Claim 52 includes the limitations of claim 41 by virtue of being dependent on claim 41. Therefore, claims 15, 18-20, and 52 are patentable over the combination of Li and Anderson for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claims 1 and 41.

Examiner rejected claims 22-23, 25-26, and 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,493 to Acharya et al.

Acharya discloses “a method that includes splitting raw image data into a plurality of channels including color plane difference channels, and then compressing separately each of these channels using a two-dimensional discrete wavelet transform.” (Acharya, Abstract.) Acharya fails to teach or suggest compression of images, and therefore fails to remedy the shortcomings of Li discussed above. Therefore, Acharya in combination with Le does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Claims 22-23, 25-26, and 36-37 include the limitations of claim 1 by virtue of being dependent on claim 1.

Therefore, claims 22-23, 25-26, and 36-37 are patentable over the combination of Li and Acharya for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

**Conclusion**


Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, Examiner is invited to contact Elena Dreszer at (408) 947-8200.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 03-30-05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Elena B. Dreszer  
Reg. No. 55,128

Customer No. 08791  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(408) 720-8300